

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 were presented for examination, and all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 are presented for examination, of which claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-22 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

I. Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner contends that the claim as a whole is directed to an abstract idea. Claim 1 is independent and claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims as originally filed are directed to statutory subject matter. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicants hereby amend claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites steps performed by the computer management system and thus, for at least this reason sufficiently recites a machine. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is directed to patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on and incorporate all of the patent eligible subject matter of claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are also patent eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

II. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 17-18 rejected over Roy, Almog and Balabine

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Roy et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0069080) (hereinafter “Roy”) in view of Almog et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0002479) (hereinafter “Almog”) further in view of Balabine et al. (US 5,937,406) (hereinafter “Balabine”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,723 to Danielson et al. (“Danielson”). Amended claims 1, 17 and 18 are independent. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection. To the extent the Examiner maintains the rejection over the claims as amended, Applicants submit that Roy, Almog and Balabine, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

A. Amended Independent Claims 1, 17 and 18 Patentable over Roy, Danielson, Almog and Balabine

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Claims 1, 17 and 18 recite in part:

receiving, by the another instance of the computer-based management system during the job description development process by the requirements specialist working interactively with the second user, a selection from the recruitment specialist of at least one component from the first set of components stored in the online database and displaying the selection to the second user.

Applicant submits that the combination of Roy, Danielson, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest at least the above features of the claimed invention.

None of the references teach or suggest that during a job description development process by the requirements specialist working interactively with a user that: (i) a selection is received from the recruitment specials for a component of set of components for a job description stored in the online database and (ii) displaying the selection of the component to the user. The Examiner relies on Roy and Danielson for the interactive features of the claimed invention while citing Almog and Balabine for other purposes. Roy is cited for working with a recruitment specialist during a job description development process. However, Roy does not offer any description of how an employer and recruiter work together via an instance of computer management system to create the job description from an online database and thus does not describe a selection of an object from a database for a job description to be displayed to another user. Although Danielson describes a groupware tool for users to work on the same document, Danielson also does not offers any description or suggestion of one user selecting components for a job description from an online database and displaying the selection to the other user during a job description development process. As Almog and Balabine were cited for other purposes, neither Almog nor Balabine bridge the deficiencies in the combination of Roy and Danielson. As such, the combination of Roy, Danielson, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Roy, Danielson, Almog and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 17 and 18, Applicant submits that claims are 1, 17 and 18 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

III. Claims 12-16 and 19-22 rejected over Roy, Danielson and Balabine

Claims 12-16 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy in view of Danielson et al. (US 6,993,723) and further in view of Balabine. Amended claims 12, 19 and 20 are independent. Claims 13-16 and 21 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 12 as amended. Claim 22 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 20 as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Roy, Danielson and Balabine, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims as amended.

A. Independent Claims 12, 19 and 20 Patentable over Roy, Danielson and Balabine

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

Claims 12, 19 and 20 recite in part:

receiving, by the another instance of the computer-based management system during the job description development process by the requirements specialist working interactively with the client, a selection from the recruitment specialist of the at least one object-oriented object from the online database and displaying the selected object-oriented object to the client.

Applicant submits that the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest at least the above feature of the claimed invention.

The combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest during a job description development process that is interactive between the client and the requirements specialist, receiving a selection by the requirements specialist of an object-oriented object for a job description from the online database and displaying the selected object-oriented object to the client. The Examiner relies on Roy and Danielson for these features while citing Balabine for other purposes. As previously discussed Roy does not teach or suggest a client working interactively with a requirements specialist to select objects for a job description from an online database. Danielson does not bridge these deficiencies of Roy because Danielson fails to describe or suggest selecting an object-oriented object for a job description from an online database and displaying the selected object-oriented object to the client during a job description development process. As Balabine is cited for other purposes, the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because the combination of Roy, Danielson and Balabine fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 12, 19 and 20, Applicant submits that claims 12, 19 and 20 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 13-16 and 21 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 12. Claim 22 depends on and incorporates all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 20. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 13-16 and 21-22 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 12-16 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number identified below.

Dated: September 28, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
/Christopher J. McKenna/

Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant
Foley and Lardner LLP
111 Huntington Ave
Boston, MA 02199
(617) 342-4057 (phone)
(617) 342-4001 (fax)